

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

1. The priority claim acknowledgment in paragraph 12 of PTOL-326 is appreciated.

2. The title has been shortened to reflect the fact that the claims in the application are now directed to an armrest for a motor vehicle.

3. The objection to the drawing is noted and replacement sheets have been provided. The quality of the drawing conforms to the standards of the Patent and Trademark Office.

The Examiner has raised a question as to reference numerals 33, 174 and 261 in FIG. 7. In FIG. 7, as is clear from the drawing now provided, the projection has been labeled, at 33, the beveled surface of the notch at 174 and the beveled surface cooperating therewith at 261. Since the two surfaces lie against one another and one of them is formed by the projection, obviously all of these reference numerals will be close to one another.

4. The specification has been corrected to eliminate the objection raised by the Examiner.

The stop 50 is engaged by the abutment 175 as will be apparent from FIG. 7, extreme right.

The arms 172 (and 182), FIGS. 4a and 4b and FIG. 7, have notches or undercuts 174, 184 at their ends (FIG. 7 and FIGS. 4a and 4b). These notches are engaged by the projections 33 as the revised text shows. Since the revisions are fully supported by the

drawing, they do not involve any new matter.

The corrections required by the Examiner in other respects have also been made.

5. The claims have been amended to specify that the armrest is the body which breaks away from the hinge and can be removed from the hinge structure with the mechanism recited.

The Examiner has cited the Davis et al Patent 5,021,922 reference as anticipatory of claims 1 to 5 and as rendering the remaining claims obvious, but David et al certainly does not teach or suggest the same or a similar mechanism applied to a motor vehicle armrest. The armrest of a motor vehicle poses a very special problem as the specification makes clear. That is because of the length of the armrest by comparison with the hinge structure.

With the system of the invention damage to the armrest or the hinge structure is precluded even when the armrest is treated in a rough manner. There is no reference in the case which discloses or suggests an armrest system as now claimed and consequently, the amended claims are believed to be allowable and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicant

db-

DATED: February 1, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900

Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600

Encls: Substitute Sheets